

1
2
3
4
5
6 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
7 **EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON**

8 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

9 Plaintiff,

10 vs.

11 LEONEL MICHEL VARGAS,

12 Defendant

Case No.: CR-13-6025-EFS

Reply Brief

13
14 The government virtually concedes that the defendant has a reasonable
15 subjective expectation that his home would be free of intense long term video
16 surveillance was reasonable. The remote location of the defendant's home is
17 such that when members of the public approach on the public way, their
18 presence would have been known to the defendant.
19

20 The government first argues that there is no search because the "front
21 yard is the face that a house presents to the world." (Government's
22 Supplemental Briefing page 1). This ignores that the search was of the protected
23 curtilage area of the front door and side of defendant's home, and the
24 government knew it's surveillance had to be secret because an approach on the
25 public road would have been observed.
26
27

28 **REPLY BRIEF- 1**

JOHN S. MATHESON, ESQ.
315 W. KENNEWICK AVE.
KENNEWICK, WA 99336
(509)586-3091